



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fact that he attempted, in the second volume of his work, a classification of the sciences which he urges as historical, logical, and practical. Religion he regards as the metaphysical complement of the sciences. In its day the author's doctrine was looked at askance because he suggested the fallibility of dogmas supposed to be based on Scripture. His programme for his work was never completed, nor does the present volume advance it toward completion. In a sense it is supplementary. Any who are curious may glean the essence of the former volumes, with some modern emendations, in the brief statement prefixed to this. The bulk of the work is taken up with extolling Butler, condemning Strauss, and presenting a scientific argument for religion. To our author the Bible "cannot but be infallible and inerrant, the very Word of God;" "it is only our human interpretation that is fallible and errant." He welcomes criticism that recognizes this canon. The practiced reader will recognize the result. The Bible is a source, not only of religion, but also of scientific teaching.

The biography of Dr. Shields which the volume contains is interesting as throwing light on the life of the writer, and as giving the motive for his work. Thought, however, is advancing so rapidly that this volume seems like a voice from the past.

WILLIAM THEODORE PAULLIN

GREEN BAY, WIS.

#### KNOWLEDGE OF GOD

Under the above title Professor Gwatkin presents to the public his Gifford Lectures of 1904 and 1905.<sup>1</sup> He deals with his subject in a comprehensive manner, seeking in the first series to bring out the contribution which natural theology makes to our knowledge of God, and in the second to sum up the salient contributions of history.

In the apologetical task the author starts with the argument for the possibility of a revelation of God.

If there is a God—a personal Being above us and not below us—I think we may take it as possible that he may have something to reveal; and then, if he is able to reveal it, if he may be supposed willing to do so, and if man is able to receive it—on these four conditions revelation is possible, and the question whether or how far there is a revelation in such or such facts is simply a question of evidence.

This sentence gives a very good idea of the method employed in the first series of lectures. Dealing first with the supposition of the existence of

<sup>1</sup> *The Knowledge of God*. By Henry Melville Gwatkin. 2 vols. New York: Scribner, 1906. Vol. I, 308 pages; Vol. II, 330 pages. \$3.75 net.

a God, the author points out that whatever tells us *that* God is informs us at the same time of *what* he is; that is, in the facts which convince us of his existence we have a revelation of his character. The existence of God cannot be demonstrated, since the "postulate of his existence is the necessary postulate of every argument instead of the logical conclusion of one argument;" but the virtual universality of religion, the influence of things upon each other, the moral necessity for a deeper reading of causation than science gives, the explanation of matter, life, and conscience, make belief in God very rational and convincing.

If we turn to the realm of nature, we find evidence of an "eternal person indefinitely great in power and intellect." And if we give up the idea of sundry special adaptations and deal with the laws of development itself, we may still employ the design argument to express the wisdom and power of God in nature. But a more adequate revelation of God is found in man, in the harmony of his conscience with his will. Further, it is here that we learn that sympathy and trust, the application of the feelings of the heart as well as the intellect, are essential to obtain the revelation conveyed in a person. So that, if God is a person, we must assume a personal relation to him.

In addition to this revelation of God, natural theology can determine in advance, from a study of the needs of man and the character of God, the peculiar nature of any special revelation which might be given by God to man. Such a revelation might arise from the fact of sin; it would have some quality of mediation necessary to remove sin; it would be a practical, serious, and moral revelation. Natural theology may also deal with such terms as "inspiration," "prophecy," and "miracle," and one chapter is devoted to the examination of them in the first series.

In the second series of lectures Professor Gwatkin shows how in the sphere of religion knowledge of God has actually developed along the lines which he marked out in natural theology. Omitting the oriental religions of China, India, and Egypt, and passing rapidly over the primitive religions and the religion of Greece, he proceeds to sketch the salient features of the knowledge of God as they have emerged in the long historical development of the Hebrew and Christian religion.

In both its apologetic and its historical task this work is conservative and follows in the beaten paths of the traditional methods. In the philosophical thought one is reminded at times of Professor Campbell Fraser, to whom the author acknowledges indebtedness, though one misses the philosophic spirit and breadth and the dignity of expression that characterize the latter. On the historical side Professor Gwatkin is more at home,

though one cannot escape here the feeling of special pleading which does injustice to many facts and persons of history. Take, for example, such statements as these:

The gospel makes no outward acts unconditionally binding, but the two sacraments ordained by Christ himself. All further institutions and ordinances are ordained by men, and may for some cause be changed by men without disloyalty to Christ. . . . Personal infallibility is a tenable theory in the case of Jesus of Nazareth, because Christians believe him without sin. . . . The *prima facie* inference is evident that Jesus claimed to be the Son of God in the full Christian sense.

But, did Christ make the sacraments "unconditionally binding," or did the church? If he did, where, in principle, is the freedom of the gospel and its superiority to Judaism? Is the sinlessness of Christ a proved fact of history or a dogma of the church? Even as historical fact does it carry with it the infallibility of Jesus? If so where, again, is the freedom of the gospel? The last statement does injustice to biblical history, and we are not surprised that later Athanasius is represented as standing on biblical ground, while Arius is denied religious or philosophical or exegetical foundation.

The same looseness of expression and of thought characterizes his apologetic work. For instance, the supposition of God is regarded as a theory like the law of gravitation, but, since it is a "final theory," it cannot, like the latter, be subject to change. But if the business of a theory is to explain facts and unify them, it must be modified by the facts to which it gives meaning and unity; and a final theory—that is, one which seeks to unify universals—is subject to the same law of change. Otherwise it is useless; for it is not being used in actual life. Again: "If all things are not independent of each other, they must all (including ourselves) be dependent on something else." But why not regard them as interdependent? And if not, then must we not extend the causal relation *ad infinitum*?

In the design argument Professor Gwatkin strips off all the conditions that give rise to the origination and realization of a human design or plan, and then claims that the analogy holds when applied to God. But if one maintains this form of argument, must one not take with it the conception of God which it involves?

In *Christian Theism and Spiritual Monism* we have a very readable book.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Walker shows wide reading in science and philosophy, and states his position with clearness and force. On the principles of modern

<sup>2</sup> *Christian Theism and Spiritual Monism*. By W. L. Walker. Edinburgh: Clark; New York: Scribner, 1906, 484 pages. \$3 net.

science and of the idealistic philosophy he seeks to establish a form of monism consistent with the Christian thought of God. He starts with the familiar idealistic argument that the existence of science or of knowledge implies the uniformity or rationality of nature—a rational universe—one that has a “Divine Mind as its source or producing Power.”

The causal principle demands such a conception to explain the existence of reason within ourselves and in nature. The reasonableness of such a position becomes even clearer when one considers such terms as “matter,” “mind,” “energy,” and “life” as science regards them today. For the scientific thought of matter is today that of electrons in motion; energy is the “manifestation of motion.” Thus what we have from all these terms is the conception of motion in which some “power is manifested;” and it is easy to think of matter as the “expression of spirit.” Corroborating this are the tendencies in evolutionary theory today which make it easy for us to believe in evolution by a rational power. The best example of evolution is that controlled by the conscious selective purpose of man himself, and in nature we must think that the process is controlled by a reason outside of man. And, since it is irrational to think of anything in the process which was not already in the source, we are led back to a rational, eternal God, a “God who must be Absolute Reality in himself apart from the developing creation,” who is “Infinite, Unlimited, Unconditioned, Perfect Being,” and yet who “has conditioned himself in our world and is realizing himself in finite forms.”

What we have here is evolution within limits. “The world is the scene of an evolution, but it cannot be the evolution of God.” But just what is the relation of God to the world, or of God as he is in himself to God as he has conditioned himself in our world and is realizing himself in finite forms? If God is unconditioned and perfect in himself, why does he undertake to condition himself and realize himself in finite forms? If God in himself is reality complete and apart from our world with its history and struggle, then the latter is pure illusion, and it is a problem to account even for the illusion. But if the processes of our world are real, if human knowledge and morality and goodness have value, then they must be included in reality itself, and reality must be evolving. Moreover, if the principle of causation arises within experience to account for the different elements in experience, it is a question if it is justifiable to apply it to explain experience itself.

Mr. Walcott has published a thesis,<sup>3</sup> which he submitted to the University of Columbia for the degree of doctor of philosophy. It is a historical

<sup>3</sup> *Kantian and Lutheran Elements in Ritschl's Conception of God.* By Gregory Dexter Walcott. New York: Columbia University, 1904. 121 pages.

study written in an impartial spirit, and forms a genuine contribution to the literature of the Ritschlian movement. In the first two chapters the author points out the essential elements both in Luther's and in Kant's conception of God, while the last two chapters deal with the conception of Ritschl and of its relation to these thinkers. Mr. Walcott regards Ritschl's primary interest the religious and historical one, and believes that his conception of God was formed largely from a study of the New Testament writings and from the religious teaching of Luther. Even his doctrine of the value-judgment goes back on the religious side to Luther's doctrine of faith. On the other hand, Ritschl was a thorough student of philosophy, influenced strongly by neoKantianism, and either directly or indirectly his value-judgment shows Kantian influence. This may have come, however, through Lotze, whose theory of knowledge Ritschl accepted. The position taken by Mr. Walcott in regard to Ritschl is similar to that of the reviewer in two recent articles in this *Journal* upon the metaphysical and religious presuppositions of Ritschl. We cannot quite agree with the mild and qualified criticism that Ritschl failed to "emphasize morality as an attribute of God." He may not make a clear distinction between the moral and the religious, or his statement of the distinction may not be tenable; but it is precisely the ethical attributes of the character of God which his theology makes prominent, and it seems to me it is just his type of theology that leaves place for the advancing conceptions of morality to be idealized in its conception of God.

W. C. KEIRSTEAD

WOODSTOCK, N. B.

---

#### STUDIES OF ALLEGED MANIFESTATIONS OF THE SUPER-NATURAL

These three volumes<sup>1</sup> are connected in that they deal with phases of the pathology of religion, with sides of the religious life which are more or less *outré* and, in different degrees, under the ban of suspicion of the Christian world at large. The faith-healing of Dr. Dowie and the other-world communications of Dr. Funk were anticipated by the cures through incubation and the oracles of which Miss Hamilton treats.

<sup>1</sup> *John Alexander Dowie and the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion.* By Rolvix Harlan. With an Introductory Preface by Franklin Johnson, Evansville, Wis.: Published by the Author, 1906. xiv+204 pages. \$1.25.

*The Psychic Riddle.* By Isaac K. Funk, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1907. viii+243 pages. \$1.

*Incubation; or, The Cure of Disease in Pagan Temples and Christian Churches.* By Mary Hamilton, St. Andrews, Scotland: Henderson, 1906. 223 pages.